

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated October 6, 2008, it appears that claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Neill, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018715, ("O'Neill"). Claims 8, 9 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill in view of Yu U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018715 ("Yu"). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill in view of Yu and in further view of Magret et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,804,221 ("Magret").

Claims 1-14 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 12, and 14 have been amended in order to clarify the subject matter that the Applicant considers to be the invention. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by O'Neill, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018715, ("O'Neill").

Claims 1 and 4 require that the packet forwarding unit of a relay device is operable to forward subsequently received multicast packets for the multicast group for a specified time period to a care-of address and not forward the multicast packets after expiration of the specified period of time.

O'Neill discloses a technique for permitting a mobile host to roam in a foreign network, with multiple access node handoffs, while permitting foreign network multicasting by (i) having the mobile node (MN) use a persistent address, for purposes of multicasting, and (ii) relaxing or modifying reverse path forwarding checks, and (iii) modifying the forwarding of multicast packets sent from a non-local source address.

Although O'Neill discloses multicast joins and roaming by a mobile host in a foreign network, O'Neill does not disclose or suggest a relay device that is operable to forward subsequently received multicast packets for the multicast group for a specified time period to a care-of address and not forward the multicast packets after expiration of the specified period of time. The Applicant agrees that O'Neill discloses join messages, permitting mobile hosts to roam in a foreign network, and multiple access node handoffs. However, O'Neill is silent about a relay device that is operable to forward subsequently received multicast packets for the multicast group for a "specified time period" to a care-of address. There is no time period that is explicitly provided (i.e., specified time period) as a condition for allowing the forwarding of multicast packets for a multicast group. Paragraphs 0015, and 101-104 of O'Neill are absolutely silent on there being any time limit (i.e., "specified time period") on performing forwarding operations. Likewise, O'Neill is also silent on a relay device not forward the multicast packets after expiration of the "specified period of time." Thus, O'Neill provides no disclosure or suggestion of this feature as recited in claims 1 and 4, and thus, does not anticipate claims 1 and 4.

Claims 2-3, 5 and 6 depend from claims 1 and 4 respectively and are not taught by O'Neill for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 4.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 9 and 12-14 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over O'Neill in view of Yu.

Claims 8,12, and 14 each recite allowing the encapsulation and forwarding, at the home agent, of multicast packets to a care-of address of the mobile node for a specified limited time period and preventing the encapsulation and forwarding, at the home agent, the multicast packets to a care-of address of the mobile node after expiration of the

specified period of time if, based on content of the notification, the foreign subnetwork to which the mobile node has moved is a multicast protocol compatible subnetwork.

The Examiner admits that O'Neill does not disclose or suggest a specified time period for a home agent to forward multicast packets. Yu does not cure the deficiencies of O'Neill. Yu discloses the use of a TTL field. However, a TTL field only defines a time period that a packet can exist before it is discarded. It does not dictate how long a home agent will continue to allow forwarding of multicast packets regardless of the value in their TTL field. As now claimed in claims 8, 12 and 14, a home agent will allow forwarding of multicast packets until the time period specified for allowing forwarding of multicast packets has expired. As claimed, a home agent can prevent the forwarding of a packet regardless of the TTL field. Therefore, claims 8, 12 and 14 are not taught or suggested, alone or in combination, by O'Neill and Yu

Claims 9 and 13, which depend from claims 8 and 12, are not taught or suggested by the combination of O'Neill and Yu for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 8, 12 and 14.

The Applicant respectfully suggests that claims 7, 10, and 11 are not unpatentable over any of combination of O'Neill Yu, and Magret because Magret does not cure the deficiencies of O'Neill and Yu. Magret discloses a method and apparatus for registering a mobile node in both home and in foreign domains. Magret also discloses a registration lifetime. However, Magret also does not disclose that a home agent is allowed to forward multicast packets for a specified time period and prevented from forwarding multicast packets after expiration of the specified time period. Therefore, claims 7, 10, and 11 are not unpatentable over any combination of O'Neill, Yu and Magret.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance .of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4545 (5243-004-US01).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Chadwick A. Jackson/

Chadwick A. Jackson
Reg. No. 46,495

Dated: April 1, 2009

Hanify & King, P.C.
1875 K Street, N.W., Suite 707
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 403-2100 Tel.
(202) 429-4380 Fax